



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# ENGLAND AND THE TRANSVAAL.

BY THE RT. HON. THE EARL GREY.

---

IN Burke's immortal speech on "Conciliation with America" (1775), there occurs a famous passage descriptive of the phenomenal growth of that country during the life of the first Lord Bathurst, then in the last year of his prolonged and distinguished career. The orator imagines the angel of Lord Bathurst to have appeared to him in 1704, when he was twenty years of age, and, drawing aside the curtain which concealed the rising glories of Great Britain, to have pointed out to him a little speck, scarce visible in the mass of the national interests—a small seminal principle rather than a formed body—and to have addressed him thus:

"Young man, there is America, which at this day serves for little more than to amuse you with stories of savage men and uncouth manners, yet shall, before you taste of death, show itself equal to the whole of that commerce which now attracts the envy of the world; whatever England has been growing to by a progressive increase of improvement brought in by varieties of people, by succession of civilizing conquests and civilizing settlements in a series of seventeen hundred years, you shall see as much added to her by America in the course of a single life!"

In much the same spirit Sir Bartle Frere, when Governor-General of the British possessions in South Africa, prophesied to the present writer, in a letter from Kimberley, dated 1880, that if the various States of South Africa had a fair chance given to them, and received the uninterrupted advantage of just and equal government, he would witness before he died, if he reached the allotted age of man, a development which would enable South Africa, from the River Zambesi to the Cape of Good Hope, to rival Australia and the United States of America as a home for educated Englishmen.

The development which has taken place in South Africa during the past twenty years has already done much to justify Sir Bartle Frere's forecast. If its progress has fallen far short of what it ought to have been—and would have been, had Sir Bartle Frere's postulate of fair treatment and good government been fulfilled—the explanation is to be found in the fact that over a large area, embracing gold-fields of phenomenal and surpassing richness, those principles of liberty and equal freedom which were imported into the United States in the "Mayflower," and which are the tap-root of its greatness, have been deliberately and persistently violated by the oligarchy ruling the Transvaal, who, in their selfish determination to administer the affairs of State for their own exclusive benefit, have resolutely withheld from the inhabitants, who supply nine-tenths of the public revenues, those common rights of citizenship which are the inseparable attributes of free men in every portion of the world.

A short statement of the events in South Africa which have preceded and culminated in the unfortunate war between Boer and Briton is almost indispensable to a correct understanding of the present situation.

Up to the beginning of the present century the number of European settlers in the Dutch colony of the Cape was insignificant. During the Napoleonic wars, at a time when Holland was a province of France, the colony was captured by British arms; and so well pleased were the Cape Dutchmen with the change of government, British rule being found by them to be less onerous and harassing than that of their own people, that, when the peace of 1814 was concluded, the colony became, with the general consent of its white inhabitants, a permanent possession of Great Britain.

For twenty years, 1814-34, the Dutch Boers remained fairly contented with British rule; but, even during this early period, an antagonism between the radically opposed ideals of the British and Dutch settlers began to assert itself, which resulted in the growing irritation and estrangement of the Dutch population.

It was a conviction, amounting almost to a religious belief, among the Cape Dutch that the black races had been created by God to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for them, and that they were justified by the direct teaching and authority of the Old Testament in reducing these races to submission by the

sternest methods. They had lived apart from the wave of humanitarianism which had swept over Europe at the end of the eighteenth century. They scarcely regarded a black man as a man at all, and were incapable of even conceiving any idea of equality of civil rights as between black and white.

They consequently were unable to comprehend the standpoint from which the British authorities regarded the native question.

The stern measures taken by the Government from time to time in the interests of the black population; the charges of ill-treatment of natives brought against the Boers by British missionaries; the enactment of laws restraining their authority over slaves; the recognition by the Government of the right of the Hottentots and other free colored people to stand on an equal footing with whites, as regards private civil rights—all helped to provoke the strongest resentment; and when the Negro Emancipation Act was passed in 1834, and the Boer farmers found themselves deprived of the slave labor on which they depended for the cultivation of their land, without receiving, unfortunately, any adequate compensation, then, outraged, indignant and smarting under a sense of intolerable injustice, they resolved to trek into the wilderness, wishing to separate themselves as far as possible from the vexations inseparable from British principles of administration. Thus was born the Afrikaner sentiment, which, stimulated and fostered by the antagonism between two irreconcilable ideals, has now grown to such formidable dimensions that a resort to arms has been found necessary to prevent it from becoming the dominating and paramount influence in the politics of South Africa. It is impossible for any Englishman to sympathize with a movement which had its origin in the desire of the Boers to be allowed to "wallop their own niggers." But it is also impossible to read the story of the Great Trek of 1836, in which young Paul Krüger, the present President of the Transvaal Republic, walked behind his father's wagon, and of the terrible struggle, the privations and the mortality which the seceding Boers encountered, without feeling great admiration for their sturdy spirit and for the steadfast faith with which they clung to their Old Testament ideals, as they sought their Promised Land in the wilderness of Central South Africa.

After undergoing ordeals which confirmed the characteristics,

and also the prejudices, of their race, the Boers succeeded in expelling the natives from the vast territories which lay between the Orange and Limpopo Rivers. But in the case of the Boers, as in that of the Mormons of Utah, the principles of civilized administration negatived the idea that a community which had once been incorporated with the British Commonwealth could secede from its allegiance and adopt for itself a position of independence. When, therefore, the Boers endeavored to set up for themselves a separate State in that part of Africa which is now known as the Orange Free State and Natal, British troops were sent against them in 1848 to reduce them to submission. The operations were successful and British sovereignty over the Boers was re-established. Subsequently, the difficulty of administering territories so far removed from the chief British centres of South Africa, with no facilities for rapid communication, made itself apparent, with the result that, in 1852, a Convention was concluded at Sand River with the Boers, by which the British Government guaranteed to the emigrant farmers beyond the Vaal River the right to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves according to their own laws, while the Boers pledged themselves in return that slavery should not be permitted or practised. This condition, as there was no means of enforcing it, proved absolutely useless; its only effect was to cause the word "apprentice" to be used instead of "slave."

"Children were kidnapped, trained to work in the fields, had their price, and were as little protected by the law as any other live stock on the farm. The 'apprenticeship' never came to an end. Wagonloads of slaves, 'black-ivory' as they were called, passed through the country, and were put up to auction or were exchanged sometimes for money, and sometimes for a horse, or for a cow and a big pot."\*

After a few years of self-government—years marked by a continual and unblushing disregard of the conditions which had been attached to its grant—the Transvaal Republic fell into a hopeless condition of lawlessness and insolvency. The Boers were unable to supply out of their own ranks men capable of carrying on the work of the Government over so vast a territory as the Transvaal; and to such an extent was this the case that Sir Bartle Frere was informed that, when the Republic collapsed in 1877, there was not a single man in high office who was a genuine Boer of the Transvaal.

\* Martineau's "Life of Sir Bartle Frere." Vol. 2, p. 174.

Educated foreigners were, it is true, imported by President Burgers from Holland, but they failed to win the confidence of the Transvaal Boers. The antagonism which existed between the Hollander officials and the Boer farmers resulted in the complete paralysis of Government. The country was in a state bordering on anarchy and chaos. Taxes were refused; public contracts were broken, and salaries were unpaid. The gaols were thrown open, for there was no money to maintain the prisoners. For the same reason the interest due on the State debt could not be paid. Public credit was non-existent. A powerful native chief, Secocoeni, who had already defeated the Boers, was threatening invasion from the mountains on the northeast of their territory; and on their southeastern frontier, Cetywayo, with a highly disciplined army of 30,000 to 40,000 Zulus, hung like a permanent black cloud on their horizon, threatening to cover at any moment their entire sky with darkness. With this paralysis of Government within, and exposure to annihilation from without, the resources of the country were represented by a sum of less than four dollars in the Treasury! It was at this crisis that the British Government, alarmed lest a Zulu victory over the Boers, which appeared inevitable unless England came to their assistance, might plunge the whole of South Africa into war, sent their Commissioner, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, to confer with the President of the Transvaal, with authority to proclaim the re-annexation of the Transvaal to the British Empire, should the people of the Transvaal, in their unprotected and disordered condition, invite Her Majesty's Government to undertake the administration of their territory.

After three months' inquiry, Sir Theophilus Shepstone proclaimed the annexation, the Boer President, President Burgers, fully acquiescing in the necessity for the step, and most of the members of the Government expressing themselves anxious for it, although none of them had the courage to say so openly.

Before the proclamation was made public the British Commissioner submitted the draft to the Boer President, and embodied in it various alterations and conditions suggested by him. At the same time, however, that the President secretly agreed to the Proclamation of Annexation, he thought it necessary to issue a protest against it, as a means of preventing a possible disturbance on the part of a considerable number of Boers of the *lowest* and

most ignorant class, who were assembled in the neighborhood. To this protest the British Commissioner felt no very strong objection, regarding it; most unfortunately, as subsequent events have shown, as a method of overcoming a temporary difficulty, and unlikely to be attended by any permanent results.

In his letter to the Home Government, Sir Theophilus Shepstone said :\*

"Nothing but annexation can or will save the State, and nothing else can save South Africa from the direst consequences. All thinking and intelligent people know this and will be thankful to be delivered from the thralldom of petty factions by which they are kept in a state of perpetual excitement and unrest, because the Government and everything connected with it is a thorough sham."

Sir Bartle Frere gave an additional reason for Shepstone's act of annexation. He said :

"The Boer President had sought alliance with Continental Powers; Germany, Belgium, and Portugal had all been approached, and Shepstone had no reason to doubt that, if England declined to interfere, Germany would be induced to undertake the protection of the Transvaal, which would have added infinitely to our troubles in South Africa." †

The broad result of the annexation was to save the Transvaal from political annihilation. Shepstone, when he issued the proclamation, sent a message to Cetywayo informing him that the Transvaal was now the territory of the Queen. Cetywayo replied: "I thank my father Somtseu [Shepstone] for his message. I am glad that he has sent it, because the Dutch have tired me out, and I intended to fight with them once, only once, and to drive them from the Vaal. Kabana, you see my *impis* are gathered. It was to fight the Dutch I called them together. Now I will send them back to their houses."

The assertion of British sovereignty over the Transvaal kept Cetywayo temporarily quiet; but the difficulties of the position were great.

The Zulus complained that Cetywayo's English cow (Shepstone) had neglected her own calf (the Zulus), and was giving milk to a strange calf (the Transvaal Boers).

The Boers, on the other hand, complained that we had not given them the protection we had promised.

Shepstone writes, December 25, 1877:

"The Boers are still flying, and I think by this time there must be

\* April 11, 1877.

† April 22, 1881. Martineau's "Life of Sir Bartle Frere." Vol. 2, p. 183.

a belt of more than 100 miles long and 30 broad in which, with three insignificant exceptions, there is nothing but absolute desolation. This will give your Excellency some idea of the mischief which Cetywayo's conduct has caused."

In 1879 the power of Cetywayo and his Zulu army was so menacing to the subjects of the Queen, both in Natal and in the Transvaal, that it became necessary for the British Government to reduce them to subjection by arms, a result achieved at an enormous loss of life and treasure. Meanwhile, the British Government had committed many serious blunders in its administration of the Transvaal. Owing to a desire on its part to accomplish the federation of South Africa, then in contemplation, before a new constitution for the Transvaal was promulgated, there was a most unfortunate delay in fulfilling the pledges given at the time of the annexation as to the granting of local autonomy. The irritation justly felt by the Boers at the non-fulfilment of these pledges was still further increased by the unfortunate blunders made by the British Government in the selection of their officials. Military men were appointed whose methods were harsh, and who were wanting in sympathy with Boer prejudices and customs, and the Boers became consequently more and more restless under the British rule which had been re-established primarily for their protection.

The war against Cetywayo, which had been entailed upon England by the annexation of the Transvaal, had freed the Boers from the danger arising from the presence on their frontier of from 30,000 to 40,000 armed and disciplined Zulus, but left them under no sense of obligation. Unmindful of the benefits they had received, they availed themselves of the immunity which British arms had given them, to rebel against the Government which had saved them from annihilation, and caught at any pretext for reasserting their independence.

The history of that revolt is well known, because of the well-intentioned but pathetic attempt of Mr. Gladstone, to quote Lord Rosebery's language, to carry prematurely "into international policy the principle of the Gospel."

The Boer population rose and attacked at great advantage the scattered and surprised British troops, and after much inconclusive fighting gained a startling victory over the small detachment which General Colley had himself led up Majuba Hill to hold the pass through the Drakensberg Mountains.



Although the most positive assurances had been given on the part of Great Britain that the Queen's authority would never be withdrawn;\* although on the strength of this assurance many had not hesitated to invest their capital and to incur the unpopularity of their Boer neighbors by their loyalty to the British flag; although fresh troops were arriving in Natal which would have enabled the British general to lead a force against the rebel Boers which they could not possibly have resisted; Mr. Gladstone, who had recently succeeded to the Premiership, decided to treat immediately with the Boers on the basis of the restoration to the Transvaal of its internal independence. With the full knowledge that he had victory in the hollow of his hand, but in the belief that "Great Britain could afford to do things, owing to her overpowering might and dominion, which other nations could not afford to do without a risk of misunderstanding,"† Mr. Gladstone resisted the temptation to re-establish British authority; and coming to the decision, after the defeat at Majuba Hill, that the obligations arising out of the annexation, sacred as they were, were overbalanced and outweighed by the yet more sacred obligations to the principle of political freedom—which requires that the fullest measure of self-government consistent with a due regard to imperial safety shall be given to every subject of the

\*Sir Garnet Wolseley, now Viscount Wolseley, Commander-in-Chief, visited the Transvaal in 1879 as the representative of the Queen. "He made speeches in every village he visited declaring the Act of Annexation to be irrevocable, and afterward published a Proclamation to that effect. At Standerton, which is on the Vaal River, he told the people that the Vaal would flow backward through the *Drakensberg* before the British would be withdrawn from the Transvaal Territory." (Martineau's "*Life of Sir Bartle Frere*," Vol. 2, p. 361.)

Lord Kimberley, Secretary of State for the Colonies, stated in the House of Lords, May, 1880: "After a careful consideration of the position we have come to the conclusion that we could not relinquish the Transvaal. Nothing could be more unfortunate than uncertainty in respect to such a matter."

On January 21, 1881, Mr. Gladstone said in the House of Commons ("*Hansard*," Vol. 257, page 1,141):

"To disapprove the annexation of a country is one thing; to abandon that annexation is another. Whatever we do, we must not blind ourselves to the legitimate consequences of facts. By the annexation of the Transvaal we contracted new obligations.

"I must look at the obligations entailed by the annexation; and if in my opinion, and in the opinion of many on this side of the House, wrong was done by the annexation itself, that would not warrant us in doing fresh, distinct and separate wrong, by a disregard of the obligations which that annexation entailed. Those obligations have been referred to in this debate, and have been mentioned in the compass of a single sentence. First, there was the obligation entailed toward the English and other settlers in the Transvaal, perhaps including a minority, though a very small minority, of the Dutch Boers themselves; secondly, there was the obligation toward the native races, an obligation which I may call an obligation of humanity and justice; and, thirdly, there was the political obligation we entailed upon ourselves in respect to the responsibility which was already incumbent on us, and which we, by the annexation, largely extended, for the future peace and tranquillity of South Africa. None of these obligations could we overlook."

†Lord Rosebery, at Bath, November, 1899.

Queen in every portion of her Empire—he resolved to treat with the Boers after the defeat of British troops in Her Majesty's territory, as if the British arms had suffered no reverse, and to concede to the inhabitants of the Transvaal complete self-government subject to the suzerainty of the British Crown.

The results of this well-intentioned action have been most unfortunate. The loyalists considered themselves betrayed, and the Dutch throughout South Africa, believing Mr. Gladstone's surrender to have been the result not of magnanimity but of cowardice, learned to look upon the British with contempt.

Interpreting the retrocession as an act of fear, and believing that cowardice and not magnanimity was the mainspring of the action of Great Britain, the Boers became intoxicated with the hope that the time was approaching when they would be able to realize their long-cherished dream of establishing a great paramount Afrikaner State in South Africa. That the Boers had been encouraged by the independence conferred upon them by the Sand River Convention in 1852 to look forward to the creation of a powerful Afrikaner State with anti-British sympathies is evident from a letter of Sir Bartle Frere, dated May 21, 1877, to Lord Carnarvon, Secretary of State for the Colonies, in which he points out that the proclamation annexing the Transvaal to the British Crown "has startled and alarmed both classes of the Dutch, the Afrikanders and the Neologians, who sympathized with Burgers in his dreams of a great anti-British South Africa."

The history of the Transvaal since the retrocession shows a steady and determined endeavor on the part of President Krüger to reach forward toward this aim. The letter of General Joubert, the Commander-General of the Transvaal, to Lobengula, the King of the Matabele, in March, 1882, supplies a characteristic bit of evidence as to the nature of Boer hopes and the view which they took of Mr. Gladstone's magnanimity. In this letter he points out how the English took away from the Boers their country in 1877, and how they "would not listen to our nice talk for four years; but when the shooting and fighting began, the English decided it would be better to give us back our country; *that England is like a monkey that has its hands full of pumpkin-seeds—if you don't beat him to death he will never let go,*" and General Joubert goes on to say that when they have succeeded in blowing away altogether "the stink which the English brought" into the Trans-

vaal, he will ride so far as to reach Lobengula and speak to him "with the pen upon paper."

The comparative ease with which the Boers regained their independence evidently led them to the conclusion that the extension of the boundaries of the Republic would be a matter easy of accomplishment. With that object in view they raided Bechuanaland in 1884, Zululand in 1884, Swaziland and Mashonaland in 1891. In two of these instances the armed intervention of the British Government was necessary. In 1884 Sir Charles Warren was sent up to Bechuanaland with a force of 1,000 men, at a cost of over a million to the Imperial Government, to force the raiders to withdraw. In 1891 Dr. Jameson, with a small force of police, induced the leaders of the Banyai Trek to disperse their followers at Rhodes Drift on the Limpopo. In both cases the raiders were thwarted without bloodshed by the prompt action of the British. In Tongaland, also, the Boers endeavored to gain a footing, but their object was defeated by the Queen Regent's acceptance of England's suzerainty in 1887.

In the negotiations which took place in 1881 it was decided that the government of the country should be vested, not in the hands of the Boers alone, but in the "*inhabitants* of the Transvaal." It was thoroughly understood, by both English and Boer negotiators, that no privileged class should be created, and that the non-Boer section of the population should be placed in a position of absolute political equality with the Boers. These promises were quickly forgotten. The principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, in deference to which Mr. Gladstone had retroceded the Transvaal, were cunningly and with set purpose violated by the successive encroachments of President Krüger, who, conscious that the Boers were unable to develop by their own capital, their own industry and their own enterprise the vast mineral wealth of the Transvaal, and perceiving the enormous advantages they could secure to themselves by the development of those resources by others, received with open arms the Uitlander population by whose brains and energy the Boers hoped to profit, but at the same time steadily plotted and planned to keep them in a position of civil and political inferiority.

The British Government, conscious of its own strength and occupied with other and, as it seemed at the time, more important matters, allowed these early violations to pass unnoticed, and

permitted matters to drift, until the attention of the whole civilized world was suddenly focused on the wrongs of the Uitlanders in the Transvaal, in the most sensational manner, by Dr. Jameson's futile rush to their assistance at the head of 500 or 600 men. This highly irregular and revolutionary proceeding forced upon the attention of the people of England the terrible wrongs of which the British subjects in the Transvaal were the unhappy victims. Repeated changes in the law had, contrary to the engagements of President Krüger at the time of retrocession, practically disfranchised the Uitlanders and converted them into political helots. Although they owned by purchase three-fifths of the land in the country, and contributed nine-tenths of the taxation; although they had by their energy and enterprise redeemed the country from a state of insolvency, and set it in a position of affluence; although they were a majority of the white population, yet in all matters affecting their lives, their liberties and their properties they had absolutely no voice. The great American principle of representative government on the basis of equal rights, in deference to which Mr. Gladstone had arrested the march of his army on the eve of victory and given the Transvaal back to the Boers, had been flagrantly violated and set aside. The Boer oligarchy, in their determination to retain a monopoly of power, and in their alarm at the growth of Johannesburg adopted menacing methods to keep down the increasing discontent.

The following passage, extracted from the manifesto issued by the Transvaal National Union before the revolt, shows that the policy of great armaments on which the Boer Government had embarked was not, as frequently supposed, a consequence, but was one of the causes, of the revolt:

"We now have openly the policy of force revealed to us: £250,000 is to be spent upon the completing of a fort at Pretoria, £100,000 is to be spent upon a fort to terrorize the inhabitants of Johannesburg, large orders are sent to Krupp's for big guns, Maxims have been ordered, and we are even told that German officers are coming out to drill the burghers. Are these things necessary, or are they calculated to irritate the feeling to breaking-point? What necessity is there for forts in peaceful inland towns? Why should the Government endeavor to keep us in subjection to unjust laws by the power of the sword, instead of making themselves live in the heart of the people by a broad policy of justice? What can be said of a policy which deliberately divides the two great sections of the people from each other, instead of uniting them under equal laws, or the policy which

keeps us in eternal turmoil with the neighboring States? What shall be said of the statecraft every act of which sows torments, discontent, or race hatred, and reveals a conception of Republicanism under which the only privilege of the majority of the people is to provide the revenue, and to bear insults, while only those are considered republicans who speak a certain language, and in greater or less degree share the prejudices of the ruling classes?"

The petition for franchise rights respectfully presented by the down-trodden Uitlanders to the Government of the Transvaal had been laughed to scorn by the members of the Dutch oligarchy, who answered them that they were not fit to be entrusted with votes, but should have big guns turned upon them to secure their good behavior. The people of Johannesburg, realizing that their only hope of securing the rights of free men lay in a resort to force, proceeded to prepare themselves for such efforts as might be necessary to enable them to win their own salvation. It is impossible for any fair-minded man to deny, in view of the intolerable grievances of which they were the victims, that the Uitlanders were perfectly justified in endeavoring to obtain by arms that redress which they had found it absolutely impossible to obtain by constitutional methods. Unfortunately their cause was put out of court for a time by the fatal blunder of Dr. Jameson's ill-starred intervention. While British sympathies would most undoubtedly have sided with a spontaneous insurrection, on the part of a large down-trodden population, against the oppression of a tyrannical oligarchy, they would have nothing to say to an insurrection improperly stimulated from without.

The men of Johannesburg were accordingly called upon by the High Commissioner of the Queen to lay down the arms on which they had depended for the assertion of their rights, to save the lives of Dr. Jameson and his men, and as a condition precedent to the interference of the British Government on their behalf. Her Majesty's Government, by requiring them to lay down their arms, deprived them of their only weapon of defense against misgovernment, namely, "the sacred right of insurrection," and thus incurred a responsibility of a most direct and binding character, which it would have been impossible to evade without dishonor.

It must be remembered, however, that before the surrender of their arms by the Johannesburg people President Krüger had promised redress. Encouraged by his assumption of a sympathetic attitude, Mr. Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, and

Sir Alfred Milner, the High Commissioner, carefully abstained from taking any step, or pressing any demand upon President Krüger, which could reasonably be regarded by him and his advisers as in the slightest degree harsh or unnecessary.

But the result of this patience and forbearance was not satisfactory. Instead of giving to the Uitlanders the redress which he had promised, President Krüger, now that their arms had been given up, hardened his heart and mercilessly tightened the bonds of his tyranny.

The position of the Uitlanders, which was intolerable before the revolt, grew steadily worse and worse. The alterations which were made in the franchise laws, so far from meeting their most legitimate demands, increased the disabilities imposed upon them. The High Court was placed in complete subordination to the Executive, who frequently refused to abide by its decisions. The use of the English language both in the courts of law and Government offices was forbidden. In Government schools, paid for by the Uitlanders, the Dutch language was the sole medium of instruction for the older children. Even in municipal matters the inhabitants of Johannesburg were prevented from exercising any control, with the result that the number of deaths caused by neglect of the most elementary sanitary regulations was appalling; the police, composed of country Boers, were ignorant, brutal and corrupt, and a standing menace to the persons and property of the unarmed Uitlanders; the Government connivance at the sale of liquor to natives led to widespread demoralization in the mining centres, with consequent danger to the population and damage to the industry; concessions and monopolies were freely granted for the benefit, not of the State, but of private individuals; and the amounts wrung from the Uitlanders by taxation steadily increased without any corresponding benefit either through increased efficiency or construction of public works.

After nearly three years of fruitless representations, the apparently unprovoked murder of a British subject, named Edgar, in December, 1898, by a Boer policeman, and the action of the Government in condoning the crime, fired the smouldering discontent and indignation.\* A petition praying Her Majesty to

\*While £200 was all the bail demanded for the Boer policeman charged with the crime of murdering a British subject, £1,000 was the bail demanded from two Englishmen, Messrs. Dodd and Webb, who were arrested under the Public Meetings Act for having organized an illegal public meet-

extend to them her protection was signed by upward of 21,000 British subjects. This petition was received by Her Majesty, and Sir Alfred Milner was instructed to negotiate with President Krüger at Bloemfontein, with the hope of obtaining for the Uitlanders an immediate representation in the Volksraad, such as would enable them to press for the redress of their grievances, without enabling them to obtain a preponderating vote in that Assembly.

The story of the negotiations is fresh in the public memory. Suffice it to say that the demands presented by Sir Alfred Milner as the minimum of what he would recommend the Uitlanders to accept, were regarded by the common consent of the civilized world as most reasonable and just, and as erring, if they erred at all, on the side of moderation. To the surprise of all, except those who were well acquainted with President Krüger, these moderate demands were rejected. Repeated and dishonest attempts to throw dust in the eyes of the public by offering illusory concessions were made; and although the British negotiators persevered to the end in their efforts to reach a settlement which might be regarded on both sides as a fair compromise between the pretensions of the Boers and the claims of the Uitlanders, it was realized at length that their task from the first had been hopeless. Negotiations were finally brought to a close by President Krüger, who hurled in the face of Great Britain an insolent ultimatum, which was followed up by the invasion of British territories on three frontiers of the Transvaal, and by proclamations purporting to annex vast areas of the Queen's dominions to the Dutch Republics.

The evidence is now conclusive that Presidents Krüger and Steyn have been steadily and secretly preparing for years, by the importation of arms, ammunition, and of powerful artillery, and by the training of their burghers in artillery practice, to blow "the stink of the English" into the sea, on the first occasion when England might be hampered by foreign complications.

The President of the Free State has had German artillery officers diligently engaged for the last three years in training the Boers of the Free State to use the most scientific modern artillery; and in April last, before the Bloemfontein Conference took place, President Krüger placed an order on the Continent for the supply

ing in the market-place at Johannesburg, in support of the proposal to petition the Queen.

of 80,000 rifles and 20,000,000 rounds of ammunition; and it is significant that their delivery in the Transvaal preceded his ultimatum only by a few weeks.

What then is England fighting for? It is impossible to answer this question in better language than that used by Mr. Joseph Cowen, for many years the Radical member for Newcastle-on-Tyne:

"We are fighting to prevent men of British blood from being treated as 'helots' on British territory, by a sordid oligarchy which British arms saved from extinction and British generosity endowed with autonomy. We want racial equality. The Boers want racial ascendancy. That's the difference. We are at war for the purpose of preventing our brethren in South Africa from being taxed without representation; from being placed under the control of courts whose judges take their orders from a corrupt Executive; from being refused the right to carry arms, while their oppressors flourish theirs with insolent brutality; from being compelled to contribute to schools in which English is treated as a foreign tongue; in short, from being denied the elementary rights of self-government."

Let it be clearly understood what are the issues of the present struggle. Although the poor, unhappy Boer farmers may honestly believe that they are fighting not only for their independence, but for their hearths and homes, as the corrupt oligarchy, whose personal interests are involved in the maintenance of the present system, would have them believe, the truth is that they are fighting for the right to oppress the Uitlanders; and the British are fighting for the real independence of the Transvaal, under which Boer and Briton will have equal rights and stand toward each other on a footing of political equality. It is, indeed, melancholy that the desire to "put back the clock," to use Lord Rosebery's happy phrase, and to resist the application to their country of those principles and ideas which are the proud attributes of civilization, should deluge South Africa with so many streams of blood. The fact that England is fighting the battle of mankind, in her endeavor to carry the "charter of freedom to a fettered State," is the reason why she has been supported in this war for freedom by her liberty-loving sons who dwell on the fringes of her Empire.

It is the solidarity of feeling as to this principle which has secured for her this support, which has induced French-Canadians, and every section of the colonial subjects of the Queen, to give their best in aid of the common cause of liberty and freedom. The out-



burst of spontaneous enthusiasm which has been evoked is phenomenal and betokens a deep-seated cause.

An intuition thrills the Anglo-Saxon world that the federation of South Africa on the basis of equal rights to Boer and Briton, which will follow the war, is only the precursor of the federation of Canada, Australia and South Africa with the British Empire, and, in the fullness of time, of the federation of the whole English-speaking race.

GREY.